



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS.

Lucilius and Horace, by GEORGE CONVERSE FISKE. Madison, 1920. University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, No. 7. 524 pp.

In this elaborate volume culminates the series of studies which the author has published from time to time in the field of Roman satire. It bears evidence everywhere of great breadth of view, of wide reading, of the most painstaking research.

Professor Fiske is convinced that his problem must be considered not "by the mere citation of parallel passages," not "on the basis of our current romantic theories of composition," but "in the light of the theories of literary imitation current in the age of Augustus." This point of view is undoubtedly correct, but so little attention has been paid to it in the voluminous writings on ancient literary relationships that the author has deemed it worth while to devote a long preliminary chapter to *The Classical Theory of Imitation*, in which he utilizes chiefly the valuable material collected in Stemplinger's *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, adding many illustrations and illuminating remarks of his own in order to show Horace's "allegiance to these widely accepted principles of literary art." Quite apart from this special purpose, the chapter (and with it we may class the remarks in the last chapter on Romanticism and Classicism) is of great value because of its general bearing on the nature of ancient literature and literary ideals. Other scholars may differ with the author about some details but they will recognize that this is one of the best treatments of this important subject that has yet appeared.

The main thesis of Chapter II, *The Relation of Lucilius and the Scipionic Circle to the New Greek Learning and Literature*, will not meet with such general approval. Since Horace was an adherent of the plain style it is important for Professor FISKE to prove that Lucilius also adhered to it, and he labors hard to do so. He describes very interestingly the doctrine of the plain style as taught in the Scipionic Circle by Panaetius, and gathers every scrap of information as to the probable attitude towards it of every member of that Circle, but Lucilius remains without the fold. That truly Italian genius insisted on using a very racy diction, an invective of extreme violence, and a humor that was true *Italum acetum*. Professor FISKE admits that all this violates the gentlemanly principles of Panaetius and he tries to weaken the inevitable conclusion by considerations that are more ingenious than convincing. He points out that there were "nuances" within the plain style, cf. Cicero, who characterizes

some of its adherents as *callidi, sed impoliti et consulto rudium similes et imperitorum*; that some later critics apply to Lucilius terms of the plain style—*gracilitas, humilitas, even politus and elegans*; and his conclusion is that Lucilius held “a divergent theory of the relation of the loose satiric form” to the plain style, and that his *sermones* are “in essential harmony with its tenets, both grammatical and stylistic.” But in reality Professor FISKE, by means of the very mass of *minutiae* which he has collected, has persuaded himself into a false position. Cicero’s words are far from being an adequate characterization of Lucilius. Of course the later critics (Horace knew better) tried to pigeonhole him, but he is too big for any pigeonhole. In the genre which he invented, broad enough to reflect the whole of life, details may here and there be found that are in harmony with the plain style or with any other style. But when we read him as a whole, even in tatters as he is to-day, we are aware of a diction filled with words from Greek, Oscan, Sardinian, Gallic, the jargon of the camp and the gutter, of frequent violent invective—he plastered *Lupus* with verses—of coarse but effective humor, and the “nuance” deepens until it becomes a cloud which entirely obscures the plain style. Whatever may have been his attitude towards the prose *sermo* about which Panaetius discoursed, it is certain that when Lucilius wrote those verse *sermones* which gave him his fame he was untrammelled by any theories as to *τὸ πρέπον* in language and humor.

But even if Lucilius and Horace were not adherents of the same principles of style the value of Professor FISKE’s work is not seriously impaired for the significant resemblances between them concern other matters. One of these is their common indebtedness to the disquisitions of the Greek popular philosophers, many of which, by the way, were the work of those very Cynics whose style Panaetius condemned. To these ancient Billy Sundays Lucilius was more closely akin in temperament and in taste (or the lack of it) than Horace, and his acquaintance with them is demonstrated in Chapter III, Lucilius and the Greek Satirists. The fragments of these Greeks are exceedingly meagre—just how meagre might have been more explicitly stated by Professor FISKE—but there is sufficient evidence to establish the main conclusion, although the reader will be inclined to doubt the cogency of some points. For example, the terms which Lucilius applied to his work (not the “titles,” as Professor FISKE has it) tell us something, cf. especially *sermo*, which strongly suggests *διατριβή*. But *ludus*, even if Lucilius had in mind *παίγνιον*, tells us nothing since both *παίγνιον* and *ludere* (*ludus, lusus, ludicrum*) are terms applied to various sorts of light poetry. *Poema* also is a very general term, as Lucilius’ own definition shows (341 ff.). Furthermore it is improbable that Lucilius’ choice of metres was influenced by the

practice of these Greek satirists. He was merely seeking among the metres well established at Rome the best vehicle for satire. Only in the case of the hexameter is it possible that he was partly influenced by the parodic hexameter of the *σάλλοι*, but even here the example of Ennius, as Professor FISKE admits, had greater weight.

It is therefore in tone and content that we must seek the best evidence of the relation of Lucilius to the Greek satirists. The evidence is very scrappy and often, to say the least, very inconclusive. Nevertheless in the mass it indicates that Lucilius was familiar with this 'literature' or, what amounts to the same thing, with the viva voce utterances of the tribe of Greek preachers in Rome and elsewhere; Stertinius and Davus were not peculiar to the age of Horace. Whether he was directly acquainted with Bion, as Professor FISKE thinks, seems problematical. Such evidence as we have shows that it was very difficult even for the ancients to know Bion directly. It is safer to say that both Lucilius and Horace were familiar with the sort of thing of which Bion was a symbol.

Having thus cleared the way Professor FISKE attacks his main problem, the relation of Horace to Lucilius (Chaps. IV-VI), and methodically applies to each satire and epistle the principles and results of his first three chapters. The work is so detailed that I must limit myself to a few illustrations of the author's method. For this purpose I choose his treatment of Horace's first satire concerning which he asserts that "no satire better illustrates the unbroken line of the classical tradition of free imitation than these two satires of Lucilius [in Books XVIII and XIX] and the first satire of Horace." Even so I must omit much that I would like to discuss.

Professor FISKE first establishes the fact that in this satire there are no less than sixteen commonplaces of Greek popular philosophy; that by the famous phrase *ridentem dicere verum* Horace indicates that he is playing the role of the *σπουδαίον-γέλοιος*; and he reminds us that "the Cynic and Stoic popular preacher was a familiar contemporary on the streets of Augustan Rome." Both reading and personal observation therefore lie back of the preachments of this satire. The lines of Lucilius which in the author's opinion can be related to Horace's satire comprise all the fragments of Books XVIII and XIX together with some others which he would add from the fragments not cited by book. I summarize Professor FISKE's interpretation and subjoin some comments in parentheses, preserving the order which he assigns to the fragments.

Book XVIII 554 *aeque fruniscor ego ac tu*; 1167 *et uentrem et gutturem eundem*; 555-6 *milia ducentum frumenti tollis medimnum, uini mille cadum*. The commonplace "that as the

acquisitive capacity of the human belly is limited, so is the acquisitive capacity of the human heart," cf. Plutarch, Horace, 44-45, etc. The fragments are concerned with contentment. (But *fruniscor* denotes enjoyment not contentment, which Lucilius need not have mentioned here; greed can be attacked without reference to this commonplace, cf. Horace, II. 3, 82-157. As for the belly, Professor FISKE is fortunate to find among the *disiecta membra* of Lucilius a floating belly much in need of a resting place. By a familiar operation of philological surgery he anchors this organ, together with its attached gullet, between 554 and 555, thus securing a parallel to Horace's allusion. But we don't know that this particular belly was a human organ at all and it is quite conceivable that Lucilius did not allude to the belly in this context.)

Book XIX 563 sic singillatim nostrum unus quisque mouetur. Refers to spiritual perturbation or (specifically) to discontent, and stood near the beginning of Lucilius' satire. (This is wholly inferred from Horace and Greek passages in which a discussion of discontent leads to the theme of avarice.)

564 sume diem, qui est uisus tibi pulcherrimus unus. Uttered by some god who granted each discontented man the opportunity to exchange his lot for the fairest day within his conception. (But there is no allusion to discontent and the interpretation is almost nonsense. It is assumed from Horace, 15 ff., where a god grants the discontented the opportunity to exchange their lots for those of others.)

Similar objections can be made to the treatment of 565-566, from which Professor FISKE with the aid of Horace, Juvenal, and Tacitus (strangely omitting Persius II. 31 ff.) reconstructs a simile from the nursery; 561-562, the simile of the ant used as in Horace; 559-560, which he considers as essentially the same topic as 1119-20, discarding also Nonius' explanation of *optare*; and 567, which he assigns to the close of the satire, building on Marx's extremely improbable interpretation, cf. Leo, *Gött. gelehrt. Anz.* 1906, p. 852 with references.

So much for the interpretation of details. In addition Professor FISKE thinks that the whole of Book XIX was one satire, for the fact that eight lines can be fitted into one satire "raises a presumption" that the remaining three "were found in this satire"; and in this satire Lucilius (like Horace) "contaminated the two related themes of *μεμψιμοιρία* and *φιλοπλουτία*." (But 563-567 do not fit easily into the attack on avarice and in view of what we know about Lucilius' methods the presumption is rather that these lines were not found in this satire. Furthermore there is no good evidence that Lucilius in Book XIX attacked discontent.)

Conservatively then, if we would gain a sound idea of Lucilius' two satires on greed in Books XVIII and XIX, we should elim-

inate vv. 1167, 563-567, 1119-20, 1183 and confine ourselves to a reasonable interpretation of 554-562. Professor FISKE transfers to Lucilius details from Horace and others and then infers that the whole of this enlarged context influenced Horace! This procedure weakens rather than strengthens the main point: that Lucilius, like Horace, dealt more than once and often in the same way with avarice, a common theme of popular philosophy, cf. especially *stultus* (558).

These illustrations are fairly typical of Professor FISKE's method. Now Horace, to mention no others, must be used to elucidate Lucilius. Everybody will grant this. But the question at issue is as to the extent to which this method can properly be applied. Where shall we draw the line so as to be on the safe side? Professor FISKE's method is essentially that of Marx and Cichorius many of whose 'reconstructions' he accepts. Perhaps the present reviewer is ultra-conservative, but from long familiarity with the work of these two scholars he has arrived at certain convictions which may be stated here. Their services to the interpretation of Lucilius lie primarily in the masses of material which they have collected—the light they throw on the individual fragments rather than the reconstruction of lost contexts. Cichorius was able to supplement Marx in this particular because he approached Lucilius as an historian rather than as a philologist. In the use of their material, however, both have much overworked 'the scientific imagination,' greatly to the detriment of sound results. It is not too much to say that with the same material a much sounder commentary could be written than that of Marx (including Cichorius' supplements), and that in general the time has come for a reaction against the prevalent method of reconstructing work which is fragmentary or entirely lost. Reconstructions must be made but they should be made with that "rigid regard for the laws of evidence and probability" with which Professor FISKE would have us weigh his results. Unfortunately scholars differ as to the meaning of these laws.

But I would not give the impression that overindulgence in flights of fancy vitiates the book. Professor FISKE is so fair and so careful to state that he is for the most part dealing with probabilities and possibilities that one has always at hand a check upon his fancy. To have gathered in one volume practically all the pertinent material is in itself no small service. Furthermore it may fairly be said, with due allowance for every criticism, that the author has succeeded in bringing this problem nearer to solution, and that is all that can be hoped for with the evidence now at our disposal. His results need much pruning, but he has shown more clearly and much more fully than any of his predecessors that Horace worked over again, with such changes as a different age, a different personality and ideals imply, many

of the themes with which Lucilius had dealt. Many of these were themes which have confronted moralists in every period of civilization and they have been presented in ways almost countless. To Horace we must award the palm for taste, for sympathetic insight, for sheer artistry, but because of certain limitations he was inferior in breadth, in boldness, in downright vigor to his great predecessor.¹

ARTHUR L. WHEELER.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen. Von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Herausgegeben von FRANZ BOLL. Dritter Band. Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von SAMUEL BRANDT. Munich: Beck, 1920. Pp. xi, 344. Two plates.

With the present volume the plan of TRAUBE's friends who have undertaken to publish his relics is completed. In a most skilful and devoted fashion they have permanently preserved in the preceding volumes all of what he left that was in condition to appear in print. This last volume includes most of the reviews and short articles already printed. It is a fitting memorial of the manysidedness of TRAUBE's genius. He was an explorer, not a settler. He blazed trails for others to clean up. Some of his works were of large proportions, but with the multitude of new ideas and discoveries constantly pressing upon him, he did not have time, or inclination, to accumulate in comprehensive treatments what others had done. Not that he lacked either the comprehensive mind or a love of patient art. He could dictate bibliographies off-hand, though not caring to assemble them in a *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. He spent infinite pains on the form of his writings. I remember his looking up from his desk one day, as he was at work on *Perrona Scottorum*, and asking, "Do you have to bother as much in English with style?" He wrote a review as though it were a chapter in a book.

The present volume has been prepared by Professor BRANDT with scrupulous care. Notes have been added—they appear on almost every page—to bring the bibliographical information up to date, or to explain the present state of a question. Professor LEHMANN has made the indices for all three volumes on *Personen und Autoren, Sachen und Wörter*,—in which the list s. v. *Bibliotheken* is most valuable—and *Handschriften in modernen*

¹ The book is full of misprints, but one can safely assign this to the demoralization of wartime and post-wartime printing. The form of the volume is excellent except the vexatious system of placing the many hundreds of notes at the ends of the chapters.